



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/708,770	11/07/2000	James E. Obert	10001609-1	2515

22879 7590 01/09/2006

HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY
P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION
FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

POON, KING Y

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2624

DATE MAILED: 01/09/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/708,770	Applicant(s) OBERT ET AL.	
	Examiner King Y. Poon	Art Unit 2624	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 October 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 21-32 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 21-32 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 07 November 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. Claims 21-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Regarding claim 21: the limitation of "wherein the one or more third party diagnosticians do not have access to the local area network without said access authorization" is subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Regarding claim 28: The limitation of "enable a user to manually sending access authorization from the computer located within the local area network to one or more third party diagnostician, wherein the one or more third party diagnostician do not have access to the LAN with out the access authorization" is subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Claims 22-27, 29-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph because they depend on rejected claims 21 and 28.

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 21-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

5. Claim 21 recites the limitation "said access authorization" in lines 18-19. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. The share feature allows diagnosticians to access private information, not to access the local area network. It is unclear the access authorization is referring the access authorization for accessing private information or a different access authorization for accessing the local area network.

Claims 22-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph because they depend on rejected claims 21.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and

Art Unit: 2624

the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 28-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hanson (US 6,148,346) in view of Ramberg et al (US 6,857,013) and Schmidt (US 5,991,807)

Regarding claim 28: Hanson teaches a method for remote management of one or more printing devices, (e.g., 27, 31, 29, 36, fig. 1, etc.) comprising the step of: storing (column 4, lines 35-45) a printing device management application (the software that allows the system to display menus of fig. 3-8, to show diagnostic information such as printer maintenance menu of GUI object 52, column 7, lines 45-50, column 5, lines 12-14, fig. 8J; and to change printing device settings, column 6, lines 30-45, column 2, lines 50-65) located at the another remote diagnostic center (column 4, lines 10-column 2, lines 20-25, column 4, lines 35-57) on a remote diagnostic center computer (PC 35, fig. 1, note, all computers are diagnostic center computer because they can all display fig. 3-fig. 8), having an internet connection (Internet, fig. 1); downloading (loader, column 4, line 61, column 2, lines 20-25) the printing device management application from the remote diagnostic center computer to a computer (e.g., 23, fig. 1) located within a local area network (local net A, fig. 1), wherein the computer is connected to a printing device (27, fig. 1); obtaining diagnostic data (e.g., fig. 8J) from the printing device at the computer using the printing device management application (column 4, lines 35-67, column 5); authorizing access (firewall, fig. 1) using firewall from the computer located within the local area network to one or more third parties users (e.g.,

Art Unit: 2624

users from company B, fig. 1), wherein the third parties users do not have access to the local area network without said access authorization (inherent properties of a firewall); and enabling access by the one or more third party user to the printing device within the local area network to enable a maintenance technician (there is no reason why a person that fixed the paper jams or add toner to the printer can not see fig. 8J, fig. 8J is designed to be seen for maintenance purpose) to determine a condition of the printing device before making a service call (clearly fig. 8J can be seen by a user before as well as after a service called; note: making a service call to fixed problems is known and being used by all rational persons; in this case, making a service call to fix the printer when the user cannot fix the problem is desirable for the user, because obviously, the user would like to have a working printer; a service call is being interpreted as having relies on others to fix the printer).

Although the status information Hanson is designed to be used for diagnosing the conditions of the printer, Hanson does not disclosed a person that is qualified to be a diagnostician for the printer.

Ramberg, in the same area of transmitting and receiving diagnostic information for printers (column 28, lines 5-30), teaches it is well known in the art to have a third party diagnostician (service technician, fig. 10C, 10B, and 11) to received diagnostic data, from a printer, at a remote diagnostic center computer (remote computing system, column 4, lines 28-35).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Hanson to include: to have a third

party diagnostician (service technician) to received the diagnostic data, from the printer, at the remote diagnostic center computer.

It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Hanson by the teaching of Ramberg because of the following reasons: (a) it would have allowed company B to fixed the problem (yes to 1101, fig. 11, Ramberg) from a technician before calling for physical service from the technician (yes to 1018, fig. 10B, Ramberg) as taught by Ramberg; and (b) it would have save company A (the owner or the printer) a lot of money if the printer can be fixed by the printer operator of company A instead of having the technician to fixed the printer.

Although Hanson teaches firewall and that the term "firewall" is well known in the art and Hanson teaches system administrator can limited access to the printer; Hanson does not teach manually allowed the one or more third parties diagnostician to access the local area network.

Schmidt, in the same area of firewall, teaches a user/administrator would manually, using a computer within the local area network, allowed the one or more third parties users to access the local area network through the firewall (column 5, lines 35-67, column 6, column 7, lines 1-10).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Hanson to include: user/administrator manually, using a computer within the local area network, allowed the one or more third parties diagnostician to access the local area network, such that users that do not

understand firewall and how a firewall is set up would be able to make use of Hanson's invention.

Regarding claim 29: Hanson teaches wherein the user interface further comprises a locate printer feature (fig. 3-8, column 6, lines 15-30) configured to enable the user within the local area network to view status information of network-connected printers and directly-connected printers, (column 4, lines 10-20), wherein the network and directly connected printers are located within the local area network (e.g., 27, 31, fig. 1).

Regarding claim 30: Hanson teaches wherein the printing device is connected to the first computer through a universal serial bus port, a parallel port, or a network connection (fig. 1).

Regarding claim 31: Hanson and Ramberg teach wherein the step of enable access by the one or more third party diagnosticians further comprises using the printing device management application to relinquish control of diagnostics (column 6, lines 15-30, when the access is limited, control of diagnostic can not be perform anymore; also see 1016, fig. 10B, Ramberg) for the printing device to the one or more third-party diagnosticians.

Regarding claim 32: Hanson teaches system wherein the one or more third-party diagnosticians perform diagnostics on the printing device comprising diagnostics selected from the group consisting of viewing status information, changing printer settings, and running diagnostics (fig. 8J, column 6, lines 15-25).

Art Unit: 2624

8. Claims 21-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hanson (US 6,148,346) in view of Wood et al. (US 6,453,127) and Schmidt et al (US 5,991,807).

Regarding claim 21: Hanson teaches a system (fig. 1) for remote management (fig. 3-8) of one or more printing devices (e.g., 27, 29, 36, fig. 1) in a local area network (local net, fig. 1) having an Internet connection (Internet, fig. 1), comprising: a first computer (e.g., 23, fig. 1) in communication with the local area network, the first computer having a connection with a printing device (27, fig. 1); a remote diagnostic center computer (PC 35, fig. 1, note, all computers are diagnostic center computer because they can all display fig. 3-fig. 8) having a separate Internet connection (fig. 1, two different company, connected to Internet through two different fire wall) and another remote diagnostic center (e.g., 38, fig. 1) with a printing device management application (the software that allows the system to display menus of fig. 3-8, to show diagnostic information such as printer maintenance menu of GUI object 52, column 7, lines 45-50, column 5, lines 12-14, fig. 8J; and to change printing device settings, column 6, lines 30-45, column 2, lines 50-65) located at the another remote diagnostic center (column 4, lines 10-column 2, lines 20-25, column 4, lines 35-57), wherein the remote diagnostic center computer does not have direct access to the local area network (fig. 1 shows the access to the local net A from B must go through two fire wall and vice versa); the printing device management application configured to be downloaded (loader, column 4, line 61, column 2, lines 20-25) to the first computer via the internet connection (fig. 1) of the local area network, wherein the printer information management application

Art Unit: 2624

comprises a user interface (fig. 3-8) configured to be displayed on the first computer; and the user interface further comprising a share feature (column 6, lines 15-30) configured to allow a user within the local area network to enable one or more third-parties to view otherwise private information (fig. 3-8 are private information if printer accessed is limited) regarding the printing device in order to enable a maintenance technician (there is no reason why a person that fixed the paper jams or add toner to the printer can not see fig. 8J, fig. 8J is designed to be seen for maintenance purpose) to determine a condition of the printing device before making a service call (clearly fig, 8J can be seen by a user before as well as after a service called; note: making a service call to fixed problems is known and being used by all rational persons; in this case, making a service call to fix the printer when the user cannot fix the problem is desirable for the user, because obviously, the user would like to have a working printer).

Hanson does not teach wherein the printer information management system is stored on an Internet website.

Wood, in the same area of transmitting Java applet (see column 5, lines 5-15, Wood et al and column 4, lines 60-65, Hanson) to be executed by a user's computer (computer 30, fig. 1) of displaying status/diagnostic data in the user's computer (column 5, lines 25-35), teaches to store the Java applet on an Internet (column 2, line 67) website located in a server. (The series of files that include user interface display screen pages in applets, located in a web server, is a website, for establishing a program in the user's computer, column 5, lines 5-15)

Since the printer information management system (driver portion 34 is part of the dynamic device driver system/printer information management system) of Hanson, is stored in a server within the Internet, (column 4, lines 39-42), contains Java applet programs (column 4, lines 57-67, column 5, lines 12-23) to be executed by the host computer to display printer diagnostic data (column 7, lines 42-50), it would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Hanson's system to include: wherein the printer information management application/driver portion 34 is stored on an Internet website.

It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Hanson's system by the teaching of Wood et al. because of the following reasons: (a) most computers connected on Internet communicate with, and access data from websites located in server computer(s); storing the dynamic device driver system in a website would allow the dynamic device driver system of Hanson to be widely used in the Internet system by all users; and (b) it would have allowed a service person to gain access of the diagnostic data of a printer of Hanson from anywhere in the world as long as he has a computer connected to Internet.

Although Hanson teaches firewall and that the term "firewall" is well known in the art and Hanson teaches system administrator can limited access to the printer; Hanson does not teach manually allowed the one or more third parties diagnostician to access the local area network.

Schmidt, in the same area of firewall, teaches a user/administrator would manually, using a computer within the local area network, allowed the one or more third parties users to access the local area network through the firewall (column 5, lines 35-67, column 6, column 7, lines 1-10).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Hanson to include: user/administrator manually, using a computer within the local area network, allowed the one or more third parties diagnostician to access the local area network, such that users that do not understand firewall and how a firewall is set up would be able to make use of Hanson's invention.

Regarding claim 22: Hanson teaches wherein the user interface further comprises a locate printer feature (fig. 3-8, column 6, lines 15-30) configured to enable the user within the local area network to view status information of network-connected printers and directly-connected printers, (column 4, lines 10-20), wherein the network and directly connected printers are located within the local area network (e.g., 27, 31, fig. 1).

Regarding claim 23: Hanson teaches wherein the printing device is connected to the first computer through a universal serial bus port, a parallel port, or a network connection (fig. 1).

Regarding claim 24: Hanson teaches wherein the local area network comprises a plurality of computers (fig. 1).

Regarding claim 25: Hanson teaches wherein a plurality of printers can be connected to each of the plurality of computers (fig. 1).

Regarding claim 26: Hanson teaches wherein the user within the local area network can use the printing device management application to relinquish control of diagnostics (column 6, lines 15-30, when the access is limited, control of diagnostic can not be perform anymore) for the printing device to the one or more third-parties.

Regarding claim 27: Hanson teaches system wherein the one or more third-parties perform diagnostics on the printing device comprising diagnostics selected from the group consisting of viewing status information, changing printer settings, and running diagnostics (fig. 8J, column 6, lines 15-25).

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments filed 10/13/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

With respect to applicant's argument that Fan does not teach or suggest enabling a user to manually send access authorization from the computer located within the local area network to one or more third-party diagnostician; has been considered.

In reply: Although Hanson teaches firewall and that the term "firewall" is well known in the art and Hanson teaches system administrator can limited access to the printer; Hanson does not teach manually allowed the one or more third parties diagnostician to access the local area network.

Schmidt, in the same area of firewall, teaches a user/administrator would manually, using a computer within the local area network, allowed the one or more third parties users to access the local area network through the firewall (column 5, lines 35-67, column 6, column 7, lines 1-10).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Hanson to include: user/administrator manually, using a computer within the local area network, allowed the one or more third parties diagnostician to access the local area network, such that users that do not understand firewall and how a firewall is set up would be able to make use of Hanson's invention.

Note: "sending access authorization" is being interpreted as being "providing accessing authorization" or "allowed to have access authorization."

Such interpretation is being supported by applicant's specification, e.g., page 2, lines 23-34, page 10, lines 20.

10. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

Art Unit: 2624

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Conclusion

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to King Y. Poon whose telephone number is 571-272-7440. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 8:00-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Moore can be reached on 571-272-7437. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2624

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

December 29, 2005


KING Y. POON
PRIMARY EXAMINER